



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,133	09/12/2003	Jeffrey George	60518-164	7757
27305	7590	12/13/2006	EXAMINER	
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C. THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101 39400 WOODWARD AVENUE BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151				HOEL, MATTHEW D
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/661,133	GEORGE ET AL.
	Examiner Matthew D. Hoel	Art Unit 3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-30 and 74-77 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19,31-73 and 78-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,129 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '129 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '129 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '129. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user (player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '129 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

3. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
4. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,131 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '131 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '131 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '131. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user (player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '131 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the

players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
6. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,140 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '140 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '140 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '140. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user in response to the user being in attendance at an event (player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '140 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

7. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
8. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,145 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '145 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '145 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '145. '695 is able to process an alert (special event with enhanced chance of winning, Col. 18, Line 64 to Col. 19, Line 12), like '145 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance players' interest in the game by informing them of enhanced opportunities to win higher jackpots.

9. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
10. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,233 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '233 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '233 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '233. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '233 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

11. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
12. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,390 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '390 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '390 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '390. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '390 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

13. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

14. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,391 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '391 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '391 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '391. '695 teaches table rating information (activity at and amounts bet at

tables, Col. 3, Lines 42 to 60), like '391 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance players' interest in the game by informing them of the betting activity at various tables, which could encourage players to play at tables with high betting levels in hopes of increasing their odds of winning.

15. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

16. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,395 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '395 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '395 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '395. '695 teaches maintaining cash ticket information (hand paying jackpots in cash as opposed to cashless cards or accounts, 112, Fig. 6), like '395 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the security of the gaming system by verifying the amounts of the cash jackpots awarded to the players.

17. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

18. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,392 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '392 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '392 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '392. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '392 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

19. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

20. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,450 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '450 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '450 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '450. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '450 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

21. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
22. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/662,101 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '101 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '101 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '101. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '101 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

23. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

24. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,865 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '865 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '865 claims a remote system for use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1). '695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '865. '695 teaches a voucher for an associated product (players can win

casino comps for products and services, Col. 4, Lines 38 to 47), like '865 (Claim 1).

The advantage of this combination would be to stimulate players' interest in the game by allowing them to select their prizes from a variety of goods and services.

25. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claim 1 to 5, 8, 9, 12 to 19, 31 to 57, 59, 63, 65 to 73, 78, and 84 to 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2) in view of Paulsen, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,698 B2) and Brunner (U.S. patent 6,681,984 B2).

4. As to Claim 1: '695 discloses all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to a remote device for receiving data being embodied in a mobile computer which

may be carried by a user and allowing the user to use a date to process the jackpot. '695 teaches a remote system for use with a gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, a host computer coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (Abst., Fig. 2). The remote system comprises a remote device for receiving data (jackpot controller on Ethernet network, Fig. 1). The remote system also comprises a remote network interface coupled to the remote device for exchanging the data between the host computer and the remote device, the data including jackpot information for processing the jackpot (jackpot information, Fig. 4; jackpot configuration on network, Fig. 1). '695 teaches information regarding a jackpot awarded to a player of at least one gaming machine (jackpot account 14, Fig. 10). '698, however, teaches a remote device for receiving data being embodied in a mobile computer which may be carried by a user (wireless interface, Fig. 5; Col. 5, Lines 15 to 21; Col. 22, Lines 52 to 67). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the portable wireless interface of '698 to the networked jackpot system of '695. '695 has a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65). The player tracking system of '698 is implemented with a wireless network (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). The advantage of this combination would be to reduce the cabling required to implement the networked system by using wireless connections. '984, however, teaches allowing the user to use a date to process the jackpot (date stored on jackpot slip, Fig. 1). The jackpot slip is barcoded and read by an attendant using a barcode reader (Col. 2, Lines 51 to 65). It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to apply the date code of '984 to the combination of '695 and '698. '695 monitors player information such as frequency of past visits, total turnover, turnover per visit, number of games per session, turnover per player session, time of player session, and average bet per game (Col. 3, Lines 55 to 58). This sort of information would best be tracked using date stamps to track player activity over weeks, months, or years. '695 also monitors player activity throughout the day to promote play during slack times of the day (Col. 5, Lines 10 to 34). A date stamp feature could be used to track player behavior for a similar purpose of promoting play during slower times of the week, month, or even year. '695 has a handpay option for distributing the jackpot to the winner (112, Fig. 6). Fig. 5 or '984 has a handpay routine in which an attendant gives the jackpot slip to the security guard and hands the prize money to the player. An electronic file of the jackpot is transmitted to the casino computer of '984 (Fig. 5). The same is done in '695 (external hit generation, Fig. 2). The advantages of this combination would be to monitor the players' activity over extended periods of time to maximize the casino's profitability over the long term.

5. As to Claim 2: '695 discloses all of the elements of Claim 2, but lacks specificity as to the remote device being coupled to the remote network interface by a wireless connection. '698, however, teaches the remote device being coupled to the remote network by a wireless connection (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

6. As to Claim 3: The wireless system of '698 uses an IEEE 802.11 standard (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

7. As to Claim 4: The wireless system of '698 uses IEEE 802.11b (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

8. As to Claim 5: '698 discloses a wireless 802.11 networked interface. '698 does not address the wireless networked interface being 802.11g, however the networked wireless interface can be 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11c, 802.11d, 802.11e, etc. (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). The applicants have not disclosed that having the interface being 802.11g solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that the 802.11g interface of '698, or the 802.11a interface of the applicants' invention would perform equally well. Accordingly, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '698 such that the wireless network interface is 802.11g because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over '698.

9. As to Claim 8: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 10). The remote network interface sends the jackpot form to the remote device (external inputs, Fig. 2, Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

10. As to Claim 9: The jackpot form of '695 has jackpot fields selectable by the user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the jackpot information to the remote network interface located on a host computer (external modifications made to data management unit, Fig. 2).

11. As to Claim 12: The jackpot form of '695 is fillable with jackpot information by a user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the jackpot information to the remote network interface (external modifications, Fig. 2).

12. As to Claim 13: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34 to 46).

13. As to Claim 14: The jackpot of '695 may be triggered by a casino employee (Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47).

14. As to Claim 15: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot entry button (manual input, Col. 16, Lines 47 to 49) for selection by the user. The jackpot id is entered manually (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47). The remote device sends a notification that the jackpot entry button is selected (external hit generation, Fig. 2). The remote network interface determines if the jackpot id is valid upon receiving the notification (hit event validated, Fig. 5).

15. As to Claim 16: '984 teaches a barcode reader for reading a barcode on the jackpot and determining the jackpot information (Col. 4, Lines 14 to 17). The remote interface receives the jackpot information from the barcode reader (optically scanned, Fig. 5).

16. As to Claim 17: '984 displays data concerning any mismatches (Fig. 6).

17. As to Claim 18: The remote network interface of '695 is able to retrieve jackpot details from the host computer as a function of jackpot id (casino management accessing data management unit; 20, 24, 30, Fig. 2; Col. 10, Lines 24 to 67).
18. As to Claim 19: The jackpot form of '695 has a jackpot button for selection by the user (Col. 16, Lines 36 to 49). The remote device sends a notification that the jackpot button is selected and stores the notification to the host computer (trigger from external source, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 38, Fig. 2). The host computer updates the data in the database (prizes unavailable if already won, (Col. 16, Line 61 to Col. 17, Line 8).
19. As to Claim 31: '984 teaches jackpot information including a jackpot fill identifier (Fig. 2). The remote interface retrieves fill detail from the host computer as a function of the jackpot fill identifier (optical data scanned and matched by PC, Fig. 6).
20. As to Claim 32: '984 teaches a fill detail including gaming machine id (32, Fig. 2).
21. As to Claim 33: The fill slip of '984 indicates the stand the slot machine is located in (32, Fig. 2).
22. As to Claim 34: The fill slip of '984 indicates a gaming date (22, Fig. 2).
23. As to Claim 35: The fill detail of '984 indicates a gaming shift (swing shift, Fig. 4).
24. As to Claim 36: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot value on the accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).
25. As to Claim 37: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot status on the accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).
26. As to Claim 38: The jackpot status of '984 includes a request status (status indicated by being signed off, Fig. 3).

27. As to Claim 39: The jackpot status of '984 includes an acknowledge status (signed off after being acknowledged, Fig. 3).
28. As to Claim 40: The jackpot status of '984 includes a process status (slip contents matched with contents of electronic file transmitted to casino computer, Fig. 5).
29. As to Claim 41: The jackpot status of '984 includes a paid status (amount paid by machine or hand, Fig. 1).
30. As to Claim 42: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot identifier (sequence number, Fig. 3).
31. As to Claim 43: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot status (amount paid by machine or hand, Fig. 1).
32. As to Claim 44: The remote device of '984 sends a notification that the jackpot identifier is selected, the remote network interface retrieving the jackpot detail from the host computer as a function of the jackpot identifier (jackpot slipped scanned at PC and compared to information transmitted by the gaming machine to the casino computer, Fig. 5).
33. As to Claim 45: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine id (slot and stand number, Fig. 1).
34. As to Claim 46: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine location (stand number, Fig. 1).
35. As to Claim 47: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine game (machine number, Fig. 1; "slot" indicating type of game being played, Fig. 1).

36. As to Claim 48: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine denomination (Fig. 3).
37. As to Claim 49: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming date (Fig. 3).
38. As to Claim 50: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming shift (day shift, Fig. 1).
39. As to Claim 51: The remote device of '695 sends a notification that the jackpot status is selected, the remote network interface advances the jackpot status via the host computer as a function of the prior jackpot status, and the remote network interface sends the advanced jackpot status to the remote device (jackpot capable of triggering a jackpot in another jackpot system, Col. 17, Line 60 to Col. 18, Line 3).
40. As to Claim 52: The remote device of '695 displays the advanced jackpot status (jackpot status displayed Col. 11, Lines 23 to 34).
41. As to Claim 53: '695 teaches a remote system for use with a gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, a host computer coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (Abst., Fig. 2). The remote system comprises a remote device for receiving data (jackpot controller on Ethernet network, Fig. 1). The remote system also comprises a remote network interface coupled to the remote device for exchanging the data between the host computer and the remote device, the data including jackpot information for processing the jackpot (jackpot information, Fig. 4; jackpot configuration on network, Fig. 1). '695 teaches a method for processing a jackpot for use with a

gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing the jackpot (Abst., Fig. 2). '695 teaches sending a selectable form to a remote device (external value modification, Fig. 2; fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The user selects data from the form on the remote device for processing the jackpot (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). '698 teaches a remote device for receiving data being embodied in a mobile computer which may be carried by a user (wireless interface, Fig. 5; Col. 5, Lines 15 to 21; Col. 22, Lines 52 to 67).

42. As to Claim 54: '695 teaches the gaming system including a host computer and a remote network interface for coupling the remote device to the host computer (Figs. 1 and 2). '698 teaches the remote device being coupled to the remote network by a wireless connection (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

43. As to Claim 55: The wireless system of '698 uses an IEEE 802.11 standard (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

44. As to Claim 56: The wireless system of '698 uses IEEE 802.11b (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

45. As to Claim 57: '698 discloses a wireless 802.11 networked interface. '698 does not address the wireless networked interface being 802.11g, however the networked wireless interface can be 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11c, 802.11d, 802.11e, etc. (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). The applicants have not disclosed that having the interface being 802.11g solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it

appears that the 802.11g interface of '698, or the 802.11a interface of the applicants' invention would perform equally well. Accordingly, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '698 such that the wireless network interface is 802.11g because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over '698.

46. As to Claim 59: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 10). The remote network interface sends the jackpot form to the remote device (external inputs, Fig. 2, Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

47. As to Claim 60: The jackpot form of '695 has jackpot fields selectable by the user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the jackpot information to the remote network interface located on a host computer (external modifications made to data management unit, Fig. 2).

48. As to Claim 63: The jackpot form of '695 is fillable with jackpot information by a user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the jackpot information to the remote network interface (external modifications, Fig. 2).

49. As to Claim 65: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34 to 46).

50. As to Claim 66: The jackpot of '695 may be triggered by a casino employee (Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47).

51. As to Claim 67: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot entry button (manual input, Col. 16, Lines 47 to 49) for selection by the user. The jackpot id is entered manually (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47).

52. As to Claim 68: '695 teaches submitting the jackpot id entered manually to the remote network interface (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47; external hit generation, Fig. 2).

53. As to Claim 69: '695 teaches the step of sending a notification that the jackpot entry button is selected (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47; external hit generation, Fig. 2).

54. As to Claim 70: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34 to 46).

55. As to Claim 71: '984, however, teaches a barcode reader for reading a barcode on the jackpot and determining the jackpot information (Col. 4, Lines 14 to 17). The remote interface receives the jackpot information from the barcode reader (optically scanned, Fig. 5).

56. As to Claim 72: '984 displays data concerning any mismatches (Fig. 6).

57. As to Claim 73: '695 teaches data related to the jackpot processing system being stored in a database stored on a host computer (data management unit, Fig. 2). '695

includes a remote network interface coupled to the database for retrieving and storing data therein (external value modification, Fig. 2; Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

58. As to Claim 78: '695 receives, by the remote network interface, responsive data and transmits the data to the remote device (data management unit receiving external input, Fig. 2).

59. As to Claim 84: '984 teaches jackpot information including a jackpot fill identifier (Fig. 2). The remote interface retrieves fill detail from the host computer as a function of the jackpot fill identifier (optical data scanned and matched by PC, Fig. 6).

60. As to Claim 85: '984 teaches a fill detail including gaming machine id (32, Fig. 2).

61. As to Claim 86: The fill slip of '984 indicates the stand the slot machine is located in (32, Fig. 2).

62. As to Claim 87: The fill slip of '984 indicates a gaming date (22, Fig. 2).

63. As to Claim 88: The fill detail of '984 indicates a gaming shift (swing shift, Fig. 4).

64. As to Claim 89: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot value on the accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

65. As to Claim 90: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot status on the accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

66. As to Claim 91: The jackpot status of '984 includes a request status (status indicated by being signed off, Fig. 3).

67. As to Claim 92: The jackpot status of '984 includes an acknowledge status (signed off after being acknowledged, Fig. 3).

68. As to Claim 93: The jackpot status of '984 includes a process status (slip contents matched with contents of electronic file transmitted to casino computer, Fig. 5).

69. As to Claim 94: The jackpot status of '984 includes a paid status (amount paid by machine or hand, Fig. 1).

70. As to Claim 95: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot identifier (sequence number, Fig. 3).

71. As to Claim 96: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot status (amount paid by machine or hand, Fig. 1).

72. As to Claim 97: The remote device of '984 sends a notification that the jackpot identifier is selected, the remote network interface retrieving the jackpot detail from the host computer as a function of the jackpot identifier (jackpot slipped scanned at PC and compared to information transmitted by the gaming machine to the casino computer, Fig. 5).

73. As to Claim 98: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine id (slot and stand number, Fig. 1).

74. As to Claim 99: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine location (stand number, Fig. 1).

75. As to Claim 100: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine game (machine number, Fig. 1; "slot" indicating type of game being played, Fig. 1).

76. As to Claim 101: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine denomination (Fig. 3).

77. As to Claim 102: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming date (Fig. 3).

78. As to Claim 103: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming shift (day shift, Fig. 1).

79. As to Claim 104: The remote device of '695 sends a notification that the jackpot status is selected, the remote network interface advances the jackpot status via the host computer as a function of the prior jackpot status, and the remote network interface sends the advanced jackpot status to the remote device (jackpot capable of triggering a jackpot in another jackpot system, Col. 17, Line 60 to Col. 18, Line 3).

80. As to Claim 105: The remote device of '695 displays the advanced jackpot status (jackpot status displayed Col. 11, Lines 23 to 34).

81. As to Claim 106: '695 teaches a method of processing a jackpot for use with a gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing the jackpot (Abst., Fig. 2). '698 teaches sending a selectable form to a remote device, selecting data on the form, by a user, on the remote device for processing the jackpot, sending a jackpot form to the remote device, the jackpot form being fillable with jackpot information by the user, and sending the jackpot information to the remote network interface located on a host computer (Figs. 3A-E, Fig. 5, Col. 5, Lines 15 to 37; Col. 6, Lines 1 to 33; Col. 21, Line 63 to Col. 22, Line 25). Confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all required information was not entered is obvious in light of the combination of '695, '698, and '984, as established in the rejection of Claim 64.

82. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the combination of '695, '698, and '984.

83. As to Claim 64: The combination of '695, '698, and '984 discloses all of the limitations of Claim 64, but lacks specificity as to the step of confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all the required information was not entered. The jackpot form of '695 is fillable with jackpot information by a user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the jackpot information to the remote network interface (external modifications, Fig. 2). '695, nor the other references, does not address the step of confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all the required information was not entered. The applicants have not stated that the step of confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all the required information was not entered solves any particular problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that '695, or the applicants' invention would perform equally well with the step of confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all the required information was not entered. Error messages for entering incorrect data or invalid data types into browser forms are widely known in the art, including in the gaming art, as evidenced by Yacenda (U.S. pre-grant publication

2001/0003100 A1, Figs. 3, 5, 6, 9,10, 13, 14). This also is not a significant step in light of Claim 1, which is the gist of the invention, namely a wireless portable device used by a user to use a date to process a jackpot. Accordingly, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '695 to have the step of the step of confirming that all required information on the jackpot form was entered and instructing a display on the remote device to display an error message if all the required information was not entered, because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over '695.

84. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 58, 61, 62, 79 to 83, and 107 to 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '695, '698, and '984 in view of Fin, et al. (U.S. patent 6,240,444 B1).

85. As to Claim 6: The combination of '695, '698, and '984 discloses all of the elements of Claim 6, but lacks specificity as to the remote device having a web client for interaction with a user. '695 teaches in Fig. 1 a floor server with jackpot configuration information. It is inherent that such a server would have a processor. '444, however, teaches a remote device having a web client for interaction with a user (Abst., Fig. 1). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the web client of '444 to the remote system of '695, '698, and '444. '695 states that the jackpot system can be implemented with the CRYSTAL WEB ™ system of GRIPS GmbH of Germany. The cited relevant art of '444 lists the article "Crystal Web—A Distributed Authoring

Environment for the World-Wide Web," Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, vol. 27, 1995, pp. 861-870. While '444 does not further cite CRYSTAL WEB™, the invention specified is precisely that—a distributed authoring environment implemented over the Web (Abst.; Figs. 11 to 13; Col. 2, Lines 22 to 32). The remote jackpot system of '695 is implemented over an Ethernet network; at the time of invention, most networked applications using an Ethernet network would use web browser interfaces. The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the ease of use of the jackpot system by providing a Web browser interface that users are familiar with.

86. As to Claim 7: The web client of '444 acquires input from the user and formats and presents data to the user (Figs. 11 to 13).

87. As to Claim 10: The remote device of '444 has a web client for interaction with a user (Figs. 11 to 13). The remote device of '444 has a processor (Fig. 1). The jackpot form of '695 is accessible over a web client (CRYSTAL WEB™ system, Col. 2, Lines 1 to 9).

88. As to Claim 11: '695 teaches a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 5). The form is accessible over a network (external modifications, Fig. 2). '444 teaches a form accessible over a Web page (Figs. 11 to 13).

89. As to Claim 58: '695 teaches in Fig. 1 a floor server with jackpot configuration information. It is inherent that such a server would have a processor. '444 teaches a remote device having a web client for interaction with a user (Abst., Fig. 1).

90. As to Claim 61: The remote device of '444 has a web client for interaction with a user (Figs. 11 to 13). The remote device of '444 has a processor (Fig. 1). The jackpot

form of '695 is accessible over a web client (CRYSTAL WEB™ system, Col. 2, Lines 1 to 9).

91. As to Claim 62: '695 teaches a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 5). The form is accessible over a network (external modifications, Fig. 2). '444 teaches a form accessible over a Web page (Figs. 11 to 13).

92. As to Claim 79: '444 teaches a remote device with a web client for interaction with a user, and formatting, by the remote network interface, the responsive data into a hypertext mark-up language for display by the web client (Figs. 11 to 13).

93. As to Claim 80: '698 teaches multiple graphical user interfaces for providing functionality to a user (Figs. 3A-E). '444 teaches providing GUI functionality in the form of servlets (CGI, Col. 1, Lines 53 to 65).

94. As to Claim 81: '698 teaches a login layer for identifying the user (entering account number for access to casino services, Fig. 3B).

95. As to Claim 82: '444 teaches GUI Web servlets (CGI, Col. 1, Lines 53 to 65). '698 teaches menus for accessing and navigating GUIs (Figs. 3A-E; Col. 21, Line 63 to Col. 22, Line 35). '698 also teaches the menus being accessible in a web interface format (Col. 6, Lines 1 to 33).

96. As to Claim 83: '698 teaches the user having an assigned type, the menu layer for allowing access to the servlets and restricting access to servlets as a function of the assigned type (customers allowed to make transactions, reservations, etc.; casino personnel allowed to access diagnostic menus, player tracking unit status, gaming machine metering information, etc., Col. 22, Lines 1 to 25).

97. As to Claim 107: '695 teaches a method of processing a jackpot for use with a gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing the jackpot (Abst., Fig. 2). '695 teaches a host computer and a remote network interface for coupling the remote device to the host computer (jackpot controller on Ethernet network, Fig. 1). '698 teaches sending a selectable form to a remote device, the remote device having a processor and a client for interaction with a user, the web client including a plurality of servlets for providing functionality to the user, selecting data on the form, by the user on the remote interface for processing the jackpot, providing a wireless connection between the remote device and the remote network interface, acquiring input via the web client from the user, and formatting and presenting data to the user (Figs. 3A-E, Fig. 5, Col. 5, Lines 15 to 37; Col. 6, Lines 1 to 33; Col. 21, Line 63 to Col. 22, Line 25). '444 teaches the client being a web client (Abst., Fig. 1).

98. As to Claim 108: '698 teaches a login layer for identifying the user (entering account number for access to casino services, Fig. 3B).

99. As to Claim 109: '444 teaches GUI Web servlets (CGI, Col. 1, Lines 53 to 65). '698 teaches menus for accessing and navigating GUIs (Figs. 3A-E; Col. 21, Line 63 to Col. 22, Line 35). '698 also teaches the menus being accessible in a web interface format (Col. 6, Lines 1 to 33).

100. As to Claim 110: '698 teaches the user having an assigned type, the menu layer for allowing access to the servlets and restricting access to servlets as a function of the assigned type (customers allowed to make transactions, reservations, etc.; casino

personnel allowed to access diagnostic menus, player tracking unit status, gaming machine metering information, etc., Col. 22, Lines 1 to 25).

101.

Response to Arguments

102. Applicant's arguments filed Sept. 16th, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants believe the double patenting rejections are proper, but have not stated why. The examiner notes that in the independent Claims 1 in each the other copending applications with which the double-patenting rejections are done, there is a remote system comprising a host computer, a remote device for receiving data, and a remote network interface coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device. The data exchanged involve player and machine identification, with no practical effect (concrete, tangible, and useful result) as a result of the information exchange, so the other limitations of these claims besides the structural limitations are little more than statements of intended use, with little patentable weight. Only Claim 1 of '145 has any tangible result by allowing the player to acknowledge the alert. The examiner believes that all of these claims were properly rejected, as Mothwurf was used to supply the limitations in all of the obviousness-type (second reference) double-patenting rejections not supplied by the independent Claims 1 in the copending applications, as Mothwurf's subject matter is very similar to the claimed and disclosed subject matter in the copending applications. Upon further consideration, the examiner believes the limitations of Claims 64 and 80 to 83 are

properly disclosed the references as specified in the rejections for those claims above. The applicants amended the independent claims to specify a mobile computer, but this was disclosed in '698 (wireless interface, Fig. 5; Col. 5, Lines 15 to 21; Col. 22, Lines 52 to 67). The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants as to the claims' condition for allowability.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

103. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Brunner in U.S. pre-grant publication 2003/0057269 A1 teaches a gaming cash management method. Mothwurf, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publications 2004/0229683 A1, 2005/0070356 A1, and 2001/0036857 A1 teach a jackpot system. Schober, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publication 2004/0209692 A1 teach a gaming system. Torango in U.S. patent 6,435,968 B1 and U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0042297 A1 teaches a progressive wagering system. IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, "Abstraction of Remote Operating Systems," Aug. 1st, 2001, UK, Issue 448, Page 1374, NNRD44898, is considered to be relevant as it discloses the limitations of Claims 80 to 83. U.S. pre-grant publication 2001/0003100 A1 is considered to be relevant as it discloses the limitations of Claim 64 in a gaming context (Fig. 5 among others). The Webopedia definitions for CGI and servlet, downloaded from www.webopedia.com, Dec. 12th, 2006 are considered to be relevant. The Wikipedia articles for Common Gateway Interface, PHP, and Java Servlet, downloaded from www.wikipedia.org, May 22nd, 2006 are considered to be relevant. U.S. patent publications 5,770,533;

5,611,730; 2004/0127277; 2001/0036857; 6,962,531; 6,763,998; 6,113,495; 6,592,460; 6,435,968; 2002/0107715; 2005/0150946; 2005/0070356; 2004/0229683; 2004/0002386; 2003/0092477; 2002/0058550; and 2003/0057269 are considered to be relevant.

Conclusion

104. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

105. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

106. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Hoel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5961. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri., 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

107. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

108. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew D. Hoel, Patent Examiner
AU 3714


XUAN M. THAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC3700